arXiv:1211.1090v1 [math.PR] 6 Nov 2012

Multi-dimensional central limit theorems and laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations

Ze-Chun Hu* and Ling Zhou
Nanjing University

Abstract In this paper, we present some multi-dimensional central limit theorems and laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations, which extend the results of [7] and Theorem 3.1 of [4].

Keywords central limit theorem, law of large numbers, sublinear expectation

MSC(2000): 60F05

1 Introduction

The classic central limit theorems and strong (weak) laws of large numbers play an important role in the development of probability theory and its applications. One of essential ingredients in these limit theorems is the additivity of the probabilities and the expectations. However, many uncertain phenomena can not be well modeled by using additive probabilities and additive expectations. Thus people have used non-additive probabilities (called capacities) and nonlinear expectations (for example Choquet integal/expectation, g-expectation) to interpret and study these phenomena. Recently, motivated by the risk measures, superhedge pricing and modeling uncertain in finance, Peng [8]-[13] initiated the notion of independent and identically distributed (IID) random variables under sublinear expectations, and proved the weak law of large numbers and the central limit theorems among other things.

In [5], Hu and Zhang obtained a central limit theorem for capacities induced by sublinear expectations. In [7], Li and Shi proved a central limit theorem without the requirement of identical distribution, which extends Peng's central limit theorems in [9, 11]. In [3], Hu proved that for any continuous function ψ satisfying the growth condition $|\psi(x)| \leq C(1+|x|^p)$ for some $C > 0, p \geq 1$ depending on ψ, central limit theorem under sublinear expectations obtained by Peng [11] still holds. In [15], Zhang obtained a central limit theorem for weighted sums of independent random

---

*Corresponding author: Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
E-mail address: huzc@nju.edu.cn

variables under sublinear expectations, which extends the results obtained by Peng and Li and Shi.

Now we recall the existing results about the laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations. In [1], Chen proved a strong law of large numbers for IID random variables under capacities induced by sublinear expectations. In [4], Hu presented three laws of large numbers for independent random variables without the requirement of identical distribution. In [6], we obtained a strong law of large numbers for IID random variables under one-order type moment condition.

The main results in [5, 7, 3, 15, 1, 4, 6] are about one-dimensional random variables in sublinear expectation space. To our knowledge, up to now, there are no good extensions of Peng's central limit theorem and laws of large numbers to multi-dimensional random vectors in sublinear expectation space. The goal of this paper is to present some multi-dimensional central limit theorems and laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations without the requirement of identical distribution, which extend the results of [7] and Theorem 3.1 of [4]..

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic notions under sublinear expectations. In Section 3, we give the main results: the multi-dimensional central limit theorem and several corollaries, and their proofs will be given in Section 4. In Section 5, we give some multi-dimensional laws of large numbers.

2 Basic settings

In this section, we present some basic settings about sublinear expectations. Refer to Peng [8]-[13].

Let Ω be a given set and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear space of real functions defined on Ω such that for any constant number $c, c \in \mathcal{H}$; if $X \in \mathcal{H}$, then $|X| \in \mathcal{H}$; if $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathcal{H}$, then for any $\varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\varphi(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \in \mathcal{H}$, where $C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the linear space of functions φ satisfying

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq C(1 + |x|^m + |y|^m)|x - y|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for some $C > 0, m \in N$ depending on φ. Denote by $C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of bounded Lipschitz functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 2.1 *A sublinear expectation* $\hat{E}$ *on* H *is a functional* $\hat{E} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfying the following properties:*
(a) Monotonicity: $\hat{E}[X] \geq \hat{E}[Y]$, *if* $X \geq Y$.
(b) Constant preserving: $\hat{E}[c] = c, \forall c \in \mathbb{R}$.
(c) Sub-additivity: $\hat{E}[X + Y] \leq \hat{E}[X] + \hat{E}[Y]$.
(d) Positive homogeneity: $\hat{E}[\lambda X] = \lambda \hat{E}[X]$, $\forall \lambda \geq 0$.
The triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ *is called a sublinear expectation space. If only (c) and (d) are satisfied,* $\hat{E}$ *is called a sublinear functional.*

Theorem 2.2 *Let* $\mathbb{E}$ *be a sublinear functional defined on a linear space* $\mathcal{H}$. *Then there exists a* *family of linear functionals* $\{\mathrm{E}_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ *defined on* $\mathcal{H}$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathrm{E}_\theta[X], \ \forall X \in \mathcal{H},$$

and, for each $X \in \mathcal{H}$*, there exists* $\theta_X \in \Theta$ *such that* $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathrm{E}_{\theta_X}[X]$*. Furthermore, if* $\mathbb{E}$ *is a sublinear expectation, then the corresponding* E_θ *is a linear expectation.*

Definition 2.3 *Let* X_1 *and* X_2 *be two n-dimensional random vectors defined on sublinear expectation spaces* $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{H}_1, E_1)$ *and* $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{H}_2, E_2)$*, respectively. They are called identically distributed, denoted by* $X_1 \sim X_2$*, if*

$$E_1[\varphi(X_1)] = E_2[\varphi(X_2)], \ \forall \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Definition 2.4 *In a sublinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$*, a random vector* $Y \in \mathbb{H}^n$ *is said to be independent from another random vector* $X \in \mathbb{H}^m$ *under* $\hat{E}[\cdot]$ *if for each test function* $\varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ *we have*

$$\hat{E}[\varphi(X, Y)] = \hat{E}[\hat{E}[\varphi(x, Y)]|_{x=X}].$$

Remark 2.5 *It is important to note that under sublinear expectations the condition* Y *is independent from* X *does not imply automatically that* X *is independent from* Y*.*

Proposition 2.6 *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ *be a sublinear expectation space and* X, Y *be two random variables such that* $\hat{E}[Y] = -\hat{E}[-Y]$*, i.e.,* Y *has no mean-uncertainty. Then we have*

$$\hat{E}[X + \alpha Y] = \hat{E}[X] + \alpha \hat{E}[Y], \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular, if $\hat{E}[Y] = \hat{E}[-Y] = 0$*, then* $\hat{E}[X + \alpha Y] = \hat{E}[X]$*.*

Proposition 2.7 *For each* $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{E}[|X+Y|^r] \le 2^{r-1}(\hat{E}[|X|^r] + \hat{E}[|Y|^r]), \\
&\hat{E}[|XY|] \le (\hat{E}[|X|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot (\hat{E}[|X|^q])^{\frac{1}{q}}, \\
&(\hat{E}[|X+Y|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} \le (\hat{E}[|X|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} + (\hat{E}[|Y|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $r \ge 1$ *and* $1 < p, q < \infty$ *with* $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$*. In particular, for* $1 \le p < q$*, we have*

$$(\hat{E}[|X|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} \le (\hat{E}[|X|^q])^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Definition 2.8 *Let* $X, \bar{X}$ *be two n-dimensional random vectors on a sublinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$*.* $\bar{X}$ *is called an independent copy of* X *if* $\bar{X} \sim X$ *and* $\bar{X}$ *is independent from* X*.*

Definition 2.9 *(G-normal distribution) A d-dimension random variable $X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_d)^T$ on a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ is called (centralized) G-normal distributed if*

$$aX + b\bar{X} \sim \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}X, \text{ for } a, b \geq 0,$$

where $\bar{X}$ is an independent copy of X.

We denote by $\mathbb{S}(d)$ the collection of all $d \times d$ symmetric matrices. Let X be G-normal distributed on $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$. The following function is very important to characterize its distribution:

$$G(A) = \hat{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\langle AX, X\rangle\right], \ A \in \mathbb{S}(d).$$

It is easy to check that G is a sublinear function monotonic in $A \in \mathbb{S}(d)$. By Theorem 2.2, there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset $\Theta \subset \mathbb{S}(d)$ such that

$$G(A) = \sup_{Q \in \Theta} \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ], \ A \in \mathbb{S}(d).$$

Proposition 2.10 *Let X be G-normal distributed. For each $\varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define a function*

$$u(t, x) := \hat{E}[\varphi(x + \sqrt{t}X)], \ \forall (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then u is the unique viscosity solution of the following parabolic PDE:

$$\partial_t u - G(D^2 u) = 0, \ u|_{t=0} = \varphi, \tag{2.1}$$

where $G(A) = \hat{E}[\frac{1}{2}\langle AX, X\rangle], \ A \in \mathbb{S}(d)$.

The parabolic PDE (2.1) is called a G-heat equation. Since $G(A)$ is monotonic: $G(A_1) \geq G(A_2)$, for $A_1 \geq A_2$, it follows that

$$\Theta \subset \mathbb{S}_+(d) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}(d) : \theta \geq 0\} = \{BB^T : B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}\}.$$

If $\Theta = \{Q\}$, then X is classical zero-mean normal distributed with covariance Q. In general, Θ characterizes the covariance uncertainty of X. We denote $X \sim N(0; \Theta)$.

When $d = 1$, we have $X \sim N(0; [\underline{\sigma}^2, \overline{\sigma}^2])$, where $\overline{\sigma}^2 = \hat{E}[X^2]$, $\underline{\sigma}^2 = -\hat{E}[-X^2]$. The corresponding G-heat equation is

$$\partial_t u - \frac{1}{2}(\overline{\sigma}^2(\partial^2_{xx}u)^+ - \underline{\sigma}^2(\partial^2_{xx}u)^-) = 0, \ \ u|_{t=0} = \varphi. \tag{2.2}$$

3 Main Results

In this section, we introduce the main results in this paper: the multi-dimensional central limit theorem and several corollaries.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies the following conditions:*

- *(i) each X_{i+1} is independent from $(X_1, \ldots, X_i), \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$;*
- *(ii) $\hat{E}[X_i] = \hat{E}[-X_i] = 0$;*
- *(iii) there is a constant $M > 0$, such that $\hat{E}[|X_i|^3] \leq M, \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$;*
- *(iv) there exist a sequence $\{a_n\}$ of positive numbers and a sublinear function $G : \mathbb{S}(d) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{a_1+\cdots+a_n}{n} = 0$ and*

$$|G_n(A) - G(A)| \leq a_n \|A\|, \ \forall n, A \in \mathbb{S}(d),$$

where $G_i(A) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[\langle AX_i, X_i\rangle], \|A\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^2}, \ \forall A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}(d)$.

Then the sequence $\left\{\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges in law to G-normal distribution $N(0; \Theta)$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] = \hat{E}[\varphi(X)], \ \forall \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{3.1}$$

where $X \sim N(0; \Theta), S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$.

Corollary 3.2 *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies conditions (i)(ii)(iii) in Theorem 3.1 and the following condition (v).*

- *(v) There exists a sublinear function $G : \mathbb{S}(d) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\{G_i\}$ converges to G pointwise, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} G_i(A) = G(A), \ \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d),$$

where $G_i(A) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[\langle AX_i, X_i\rangle], \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d)$.

Then the result of Theorem 3.1 holds.

In order to state another corollary of Theorem 3.1, we need the following definition.

Definition 3.3 *Let $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \subset \mathbb{S}_+(d)$ be two closed subset. Define their Hausdorff distance as follows:*

$$d_H(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) := \inf\{\varepsilon | \Delta_1 \subset B_\varepsilon(\Delta_2),\ \Delta_2 \subset B_\varepsilon(\Delta_1)\},$$

where

$$B_\varepsilon(\Delta) := \{x \in \mathbb{S}_+(d) | d(x, \Delta) < \varepsilon\},$$

$$d(x, \Delta) := \inf\{d(x, y) | y \in \Delta\},$$

$$d(x, y) := \|x - y\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |x_{ij} - y_{ij}|^2} \text{ for } x = (x_{ij}), y = (y_{ij}).$$

Set

$$\Xi := \{\Delta \subset \mathbb{S}_+(d) | \Delta \text{ is bounded and closed}\}.$$

Then by [2], (Ξ, d_H) is a complete metric space.

Corollary 3.4 *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies conditions (i)(ii)(iii) in Theorem 3.1 and the following condition (vi).*

(vi) There exists a bounded, convex, and closed subset Θ of $\mathbb{S}_+(d)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i) = 0,$$

where Θ_i is a bounded, convex and closed subset of $\mathbb{S}_+(d)$ such that

$$G_i(A) := \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[\langle AX_i, X_i\rangle] = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{Q\in\Theta_i} \mathrm{tr[AQ]}.$$

Define $G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{Q\in\Theta} \mathrm{tr}[AQ], \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d)$. Then the result of Theorem 3.1 holds.

Corollary 3.5 *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies conditions (i)(ii)(iii) in Theorem 3.1 and the following condition (vii).*

(vii) Let Θ_i be a bounded, convex and closed subset of $\mathbb{S}_+(d)$ such that

$$G_i(A) := \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[\langle AX_i, X_i\rangle] = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{Q\in\Theta_i} \mathrm{tr[AQ]},$$

and $\{\Theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (Ξ, d_H), i.e., $d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta_j) \to 0$, as $i, j \to \infty$.

Then there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset $\Theta \subset \mathbb{S}_+(d)$ such that the result of Theorem 3.1 holds, where the function $G : \mathbb{S}(d) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{Q\in\Theta} \mathrm{tr}[AQ]$.

By Corollary 3.4, we can easily get the following result.

Theorem 3.6 *([7]) Let a sequence* $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ *which is 1-dimensional random variable in a sublinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ *satisfy the following conditions:*

(i) each X_{i+1} *is independent from* $(X_1, \ldots, X_i)$, $\forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$;

(ii) $\hat{E}[X_i] = \hat{E}[-X_i] = 0$, $\hat{E}[X_i^2] = \overline{\sigma}_i^2$, $-\hat{E}[-X_i^2] = \underline{\sigma}_i^2$, *where* $0 \le \underline{\sigma}_i^2 \le \overline{\sigma}_i^2 < \infty$;

(iii) there are two positive constants $\underline{\sigma}$ *and* $\overline{\sigma}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\underline{\sigma}_i^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2| = 0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\overline{\sigma}_i^2 - \overline{\sigma}^2| = 0;$$

(iv) there is a constant $M > 0$, *such that*

$$\hat{E}[|X_i|^3] \le M, \ \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$$

Then the sequence $\left\{\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *of the sum* $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ *converges in law to* $N(0; [\underline{\sigma}^2, \overline{\sigma}^2])$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] = \hat{E}[\varphi(X)], \ \forall \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $X \sim N(0; [\underline{\sigma}^2, \overline{\sigma}^2])$.

Proof. For $d = 1$, by Definition 3.3, we have

$$d_H([a,b],[c,d]) = \max\{|a-c|, |b-d|\} \le |a-c| + |b-d|.$$

Set $\Theta_i = [\underline{\sigma}_i^2, \overline{\sigma}_i^2]$, $\Theta = [\underline{\sigma}^2, \overline{\sigma}^2]$. Then

$$d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta) = \max\{|\underline{\sigma}_i^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2|, |\overline{\sigma}_i^2 - \overline{\sigma}^2|\} \le |\underline{\sigma}_i^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2| + |\overline{\sigma}_i^2 - \overline{\sigma}^2|,$$

and thus by condition (iii), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\underline{\sigma}_i^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2| + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\overline{\sigma}_i^2 - \overline{\sigma}^2| = 0.$$

Then the result follows from Corollary 3.4. □

4 Proofs of the main results

4.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

At first, we prove a lemma.

Lemma 4.1 *We assume the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. We further assume that there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that, for each $A, B \in \mathbb{S}(d)$ with $A \geq B$, we have*

$$\hat{E}[\langle AX, X\rangle] - \hat{E}[\langle BX, X\rangle] \geq \beta \ \mathrm{tr}[A - B]. \tag{4.1}$$

Then our main result (3.1) holds.

Proof. For a small but fixed $h > 0$, let $V(t, x)$ be the unique viscosity solution of

$$\partial_t V + G(D^2V) = 0,\ (t, x) \in [0, 1 + h] \times \mathbb{R}^d,\ V|_{t=1+h} = \varphi. \tag{4.2}$$

By Proposition 2.10, we have

$$V(t, x) = \hat{E}[\varphi(x + \sqrt{1 + h - t}X)]. \tag{4.3}$$

In particular,

$$V(h, 0) = \hat{E}[\varphi(X)],\ V(1 + h, x) = \varphi(x).$$

Since (4.2) is a uniformly parabolic PDE and G is a convex function, by the interior regularity of V (see [14]), we have

$$\|V\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2},2+\alpha}([0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty,\ \text{for some } \alpha \in (0, 1). \tag{4.4}$$

Set $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$, $S_0 = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
V(1, \sqrt{\delta}S_n) - V(0, 0) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Big\{ V((i+1)\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1}) - V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i) \Big\} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \{[V((i+1)\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1}) - V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1})] \\
&\quad +[V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1}) - V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i)]\} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \{I^i_\delta + J^i_\delta\},
\end{aligned}$$

with, by Taylors expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}
J^i_\delta &= \partial_t V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i)\delta + \frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle\delta + \langle DV(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i), X_{i+1}\sqrt{\delta}\rangle, \\
I^i_\delta &= \delta \int_0^1 [\partial_t V((i+\beta)\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1}) - \partial_t V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1})]\mathrm{d}\beta \\
&\quad +[\partial_t V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_{i+1}) - \partial_t V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i)]\delta \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \delta \Big\langle \Big(D^2V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i + \gamma\beta X_{i+1}\sqrt{\delta}) - D^2V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i) \Big) X_{i+1}, X_{i+1} \Big\rangle \gamma \mathrm{d}\beta\mathrm{d}\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] - \hat{E}\left[-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right] \le \hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)] - V(0,0) \le \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] + \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right]. \quad (4.5)$$

We now prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] = 0$. Firstly, by conditions (i) and (ii), we have

$$\hat{E}[\langle DV(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i), X_{i+1}\rangle\sqrt{\delta}] = \hat{E}[\langle -DV(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i), X_{i+1}\rangle\sqrt{\delta}] = 0.$$

Then by (4.2) and the sublinear property of $\hat{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] &= \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\partial_t V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)\delta + \frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle\delta\right)\right] \\
&= \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\partial_t V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)\delta + G(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\delta\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle\delta - G(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\delta\right)\right] \\
&= \hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle - G(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\right)\delta\right] \\
&\le \delta\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle - G_{i+1}(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\right)\right] \\
&\quad +\delta\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(G_{i+1}(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)) - G(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\right)\right] \\
&= L_1 + L_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\partial^2_{x_1x_2}V = \partial^2_{x_2x_1}V$, so $D^2V \in \mathbb{S}(d)$, and thus $G(D^2V)$ is meaningful. Now we discuss L_1 and L_2 respectively. For L_1, by the definition of the function G_{i+1}, we have

$$L_1 \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{2}\langle D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}\rangle - G_{i+1}(D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i))\right)\right] = 0.$$

For L_2, by condition (iv), we have

$$L_2 \le \frac{1}{n}\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_{i+1}\|D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)\|\right] \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_{i+1}\hat{E}\left[\|D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)\|\right].$$

We claim that there exists a positive constant C_1 such that $\hat{E}[\|D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i)\|] \le C_1, \forall i = 1,2,\ldots$ By (4.4), we have

$$\|D^2V(i\delta,\sqrt{\delta}S_i) - D^2V(0,0)\| \le C\left(|\sqrt{\delta}S_i|^\alpha + |i\delta|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\right),$$

where C is a positive constant. By Hölder's inequality and conditions (i)-(iii), we have

$$\hat{E}[|\sqrt{\delta}S_i|^\alpha] \leq \left(\hat{E}[|\sqrt{\delta}S_i|^2]\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{i}\hat{E}[|X_k|^2]\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{i}\left(\hat{E}[|X_k|^3]\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq M^{\frac{2}{3}\times\frac{\alpha}{2}} = M^{\frac{\alpha}{3}}.$$

Let $C_1 := \|D^2V(0,0)\| + CM^{\frac{\alpha}{3}} + C$. Then for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$\hat{E}[\|D^2V(i\delta, \sqrt{\delta}S_i)\|] \leq \|D^2V(0,0)\| + C\hat{E}[|\sqrt{\delta}S_i|^\alpha] + C|i\delta|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq C_1.$$

Hence $L_2 \leq \frac{C_1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, which together with condition (iv) implies that $\limsup\limits_{n\to\infty} L_2 \leq 0$. Then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] \leq 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] \leq 0. \tag{4.7}$$

As $\hat{E}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i] \geq -\hat{E}[-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i]$. By (4.7), we have $\liminf\limits_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i] \geq 0$, which together with (4.6) implies that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_\delta^i\right] = 0$.

Now we come to analyze the two items including I_δ^i in (4.5). Since $\partial_t V$ and D^2V are uniformly α-Hölder continuous in x and $\frac{\alpha}{2}$-Hölder continuous in t on $[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$|I_\delta^i| \leq C^{'}\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(1 + |X_{i+1}|^\alpha + |X_{i+1}|^{2+\alpha}),$$

where C' is a positive constant. By Young's inequality, we have

$$|X_{i+1}|^\alpha \leq \frac{|X_{i+1}|^{\alpha\cdot\frac{2+\alpha}{\alpha}}}{\frac{2+\alpha}{\alpha}} + \frac{1}{\frac{2+\alpha}{2}} = \frac{\alpha|X_{i+1}|^{2+\alpha}}{2+\alpha} + \frac{2}{2+\alpha},$$

and thus there exists a positive constant C_2 such that

$$|I_\delta^i| \leq C_2\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(1 + |X_{i+1}|^{2+\alpha}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{E}[|I_\delta^i|] &\leq C_2\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\left(1 + \hat{E}[|X_{i+1}|^{2+\alpha}]\right)\\ &\leq C_2\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\left(1 + \left(\hat{E}[|X_{i+1}|^3]\right)^{\frac{2+\alpha}{3}}\right)\\ &\leq C_2\delta^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(1 + M^{\frac{2+\alpha}{3}}).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right] \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}[I_\delta^i] \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}[|I_\delta^i|] \leq C_2(1 + M^{\frac{2+\alpha}{3}})\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

and thus

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right]\leq 0. \tag{4.8}$$

On the other side,

$$\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right]\geq -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}[-I_\delta^i]\geq -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}[|I_\delta^i|]\geq -C_2(1+M^{\frac{2+\alpha}{3}})\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

we have $\liminf\limits_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i\right]\geq 0$, which together with (4.8) implies that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i]=0$. Similarly, we have $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}[-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I_\delta^i]=0$.

By (4.5), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]=V(0,0). \tag{4.9}$$

Finally, $\forall t,\ t'\in[0,1+h]$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}|V(t,x)-V(t',x)| &\leq \hat{E}[|\varphi(x+\sqrt{1+h-t}X)-\varphi(x+\sqrt{1+h-t'}X)|]\\ &\leq k_\varphi|\sqrt{1+h-t}-\sqrt{1+h-t'}|\hat{E}[|X|]\\ &\leq C_3\sqrt{|t-t'|},\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where k_φ is a Lipschitz constant depending on φ, and C_3 is a constant depending on φ. By (4.3) and (4.10), we have

$$|\hat{E}[\varphi(X)]-\hat{E}[\varphi(\sqrt{1+h}X)]|=|V(h,0)-V(0,0)|\leq C_3\sqrt{h},$$

and

$$|\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]-\hat{E}[\varphi(\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]|=|\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]-\hat{E}[V(1+h,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]|\leq C_3\sqrt{h}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]-\hat{E}[\varphi(X)]\right| &\leq \left|\hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]-\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]\right|+|\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]-\hat{E}[\varphi(\sqrt{1+h}X)]|\\ &\quad +|\hat{E}[\varphi(\sqrt{1+h}X)]-\hat{E}[\varphi(X)]|\\ &\leq 2C_3\sqrt{h}+|\hat{E}[V(1,\sqrt{\delta}S_n)]-V(0,0)|,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.9) implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left|\hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]-\hat{E}[\varphi(X)]\right|\leq 2C_3\sqrt{h}.$$

Since h can be arbitrarily small, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]=\hat{E}[\varphi(X)].$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The idea comes from the proof of Theorem 3.5 of [13]. When the uniform elliptic condition (4.1) does not hold, we first introduce a perturbation to prove the above convergence for $\varphi \in C_{b,Lip(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. We can construct a sublinear expectation space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{\mathbb{E}})$ and a sequence of two random vectors $\{(\bar{X}_i, \bar{\kappa}_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that, for each $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, $\{\bar{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{(\bar{X}_{n+1}, \bar{\kappa}_{n+1})\}$ is independent from $\{(\bar{X}_i, \bar{\kappa}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and, moreover,

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\psi(\bar{X}_i, \bar{\kappa}_i)] = (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{E}[\psi(X_i, x)] e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx, \quad \forall \psi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{2\times d}).$$

Define $\bar{X}_i^{\varepsilon} := \bar{X}_i + \varepsilon \bar{\kappa}_i$ for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$. It's easy to check that the sequence $\{\bar{X}_i^{\varepsilon}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.1, in particular,

$$G_i^{\varepsilon}(A) := \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\langle A\bar{X}_i^{\varepsilon}, \bar{X}_i^{\varepsilon}\rangle] = G_i(A) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mathrm{tr}[A],$$

$$G^{\varepsilon}(A) := G(A) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mathrm{tr}[A].$$

They are strictly elliptic. Then we can apply Lemma 4.1 to

$$\bar{S}_n^{\varepsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^{\varepsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i + \varepsilon J_n, \;\; J_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\kappa}_i,$$

and obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{\mathbb{E}}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{\bar{S}_n^{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(\bar{X} + \varepsilon\bar{\kappa})],$$

where $(\bar{X}, \bar{\kappa})$ is $\bar{G}$-distributed under $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\cdot]$ and

$$\bar{G}(\bar{A}) := \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\langle \bar{A}(\bar{X}, \bar{\kappa}), (\bar{X}, \bar{\kappa})\rangle], \quad \bar{A} \in \mathbb{S}(2d).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] - \bar{\mathbb{E}}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{\bar{S}_n^{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]\right| &= \left|\bar{\mathbb{E}}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{\bar{S}_n^{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}} - \varepsilon\frac{J_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] - \bar{\mathbb{E}}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{\bar{S}_n^{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]\right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon C \bar{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left|\frac{J_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right|\right] \leq C'\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a Lipschitz constant of φ and C' is a constant depending on φ. Similarly,

$$|\hat{E}[\varphi(X)] - \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(\bar{X} + \varepsilon\bar{\kappa})]| = |\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(\bar{X})] - \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(\bar{X} + \varepsilon\bar{\kappa})]| \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Since ε can be arbitrarily small, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right] = \hat{E}[\varphi(X)], \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete. $\square$

Remark 4.2 *By the proof of Lemma* 4.1*, we know that condition (iii) in Theorem* 3.1 *can be weaken to: there exist two constants* $M > 0$ *and* $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *such that* $\hat{E}[|X_i|^{2+\alpha}] \leq M, \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$

4.2 Proof of Corollary 3.2

At first, we prove two lemmas.

Lemma 4.3 *We make the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1, then* $\{G_i, G\}$ *are Lipschitz function, and further they have a common Lipschitz constant* C_0.

Proof. $\forall A, B \in \mathbb{S}(d)$ and $\forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|G_i(A) - G_i(B)| &= \frac{1}{2}|\hat{E}[\langle AX_i, X_i\rangle] - \hat{E}[\langle BX_i, X_i\rangle]| \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[|\langle (A-B)X_i, X_i\rangle|] \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\|A-B\| \cdot \hat{E}[|X_i|^2] \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\|A-B\| \cdot \left(\hat{E}[|X_i|^3]\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{2}{3}}\|A-B\|,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|G(A) - G(B)| = \lim_{n\to\infty} |G_i(A) - G_i(B)| \le \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{2}{3}}\|A-B\|.$$

Set $C_0 = \frac{1}{2}M^{\frac{2}{3}}$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 4.4 *We make the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1, then there exists a sequence* $\{\gamma_i\}$ *of positive numbers such that* $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}\gamma_i = 0$ *and*

$$|G_i(A) - G(A)| \le \gamma_i\|A\|,\ \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d).$$

Proof. Because of G_i's and G's positive homogeneity, we only need to prove $\{G_i\}$ uniformly converges to G on the set $\{A \in \mathbb{S}(d) | \|A\| \le 1\}$. We suppose that this does not hold. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall k$, $\exists\ n_k \ge k$, $A_{n_k} \in \{A \in \mathbb{S}(d) \mid \|A\| \le 1\}$, and

$$|G_{n_k}(A_{n_k}) - G(A_{n_k})| > \varepsilon.$$

Since $\{A \in \mathbb{S}(d) \mid ||A|| \le 1\}$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{S}(d)$, thus it is sequential compact, so $\{A_{n_k}\}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{A_{n_{k_l}}\}$. Denote by A_0 its limit point. By Lemma 4.3, we get

$$|G_{n_{k_l}}(A_{n_{k_l}}) - G_{n_{k_l}}(A_0)| \le C_0\|A_{n_{k_l}} - A_0\|,\ |G(A_{n_{k_l}}) - G(A_0)| \le C_0\|A_{n_{k_l}} - A_0\|,$$

and thus

$$|G_{n_{k_l}}(A_{n_{k_l}}) - G(A_{n_{k_l}})| \le |G_{n_{k_l}}(A_{n_{k_l}}) - G_{n_{k_l}}(A_0)| + |G_{n_{k_l}}(A_0) - G(A_0)| + |G(A_0) - G(A_{n_{k_l}})|.$$

Leting $l \to \infty$, we obtain that $\limsup\limits_{l\to\infty} |G_{n_{k_l}}(A_{n_{k_l}}) - G(A_{n_{k_l}})| \le 0$. It's a contradiction. Hence the result of this lemma holds. □

Then Corollary 3.2 directly follows from Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 4.4.

4.3 Proof of Corollary 3.4

Set

$$G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[\langle AX, X\rangle] = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{Q\in\Theta} \mathrm{tr}[AQ], \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d).$$

We claim that

$$|G_i(A) - G(A)| \leq d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\|. \tag{4.11}$$

If $d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta) = 0$, then $\Theta_i = \Theta$, and so $G_i = G$ and thus (4.11) holds in this case. Now assume that $d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta) \neq 0$. By $\mathrm{tr}[AQ_1] - \mathrm{tr}[AQ_2] = \mathrm{tr}[A(Q_1 - Q_2)]$, we have

$$|\mathrm{tr}[AQ_1] - \mathrm{tr}[AQ_2]| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|Q_1 - Q_2\|. \tag{4.12}$$

Suppose that (4.11) doesn't hold. Then there exists an element $A \neq 0 \in \mathbb{S}(d)$ such that

$$|G_i(A) - G(A)| > d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\|. \tag{4.13}$$

Since Θ_i and Θ are bounded and closed, there exist $Q_i \in \Theta_i, Q \in \Theta$ such that

$$G_i(A) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ_i], \quad G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ]. \tag{4.14}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $G_i(A) \geq G(A)$. Then by (4.13) and (4.14), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ_i] - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ] = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[A(Q_i - Q)] > d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\|. \tag{4.15}$$

By the definition of d_H and the assumption that $d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta) \neq 0$, there exists $Q_0 \in \Theta$ such that

$$\|Q_i - Q_0\| < \frac{3}{2}d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta). \tag{4.16}$$

Then by (4.12), (4.15) and (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ_0] - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ] &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ_0] - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ_i] + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[A(Q_i - Q)] \\
&> -\frac{1}{2}\|A\| \cdot \|Q_0 - Q_i\| + d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\| \\
&\geq -\frac{3}{4}d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\| + d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\| \\
&= \frac{1}{4}d_H(\Theta_i, \Theta)\|A\| > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[AQ] = G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{Q\in\Theta}\mathrm{tr}[AQ]$. Hence (4.11) holds. Then by Theorem 3.1, we obtain the result of Corollary 3.4. □

4.4 Proof of Corollary 3.5

Since $\{\Theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (Ξ, d_H) and (Ξ, d_H) is a complete metric space, there exists a bounded closed set $\Theta \in \Xi$ such that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i) = 0$, hence $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i) = 0$. And thus by Corollary 3.4, we only need to prove that Θ is a convex set. First, we prove two claims.

Claim 1. $x \in \Theta \Leftrightarrow \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} d(x, \Theta_i) = 0$.

"$\Rightarrow$" If $x \in \Theta$, then by the definition of d_H, we have $d(x, \Theta_i) \leq d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i)$, and thus $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} d(x, \Theta_i) = 0$.

"$\Leftarrow$" Since $d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i) \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$, so $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, there exists an N such that when $i > N$, $d_H(\Theta, \Theta_i) < \varepsilon/2$. Hence $\Theta_i \subset B_\epsilon(\Theta)$, and by $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} d(x, \Theta_i) = 0$, we get $x \in B_{2\epsilon}(\Theta)$. Since ε is can be arbitrarily small, we have $x \in \overline{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Claim 2. The function $d(\cdot, \Theta_i) : \mathbb{S}_+(d) \to \mathbb{R}$ is convex.

Indeed, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{S}_+(d)$, $a \in [0, 1]$, there exist $x_0,\ y_0 \in \Theta_i$ such that

$$d(x, \Theta_i) = d(x, x_0),\ d(y, \Theta_i) = d(y, y_0).$$

Since Θ_i is convex, we have $ax_0 + (1-a)y_0 \in \Theta_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(ax + (1-a)y, \Theta_i) &\leq d(ax + (1-a)y, ax_0 + (1-a)y_0) \\ &= \|\,(ax + (1-a)y) - (ax_0 + (1-a)y_0)\,\| \\ &\leq a\|x - x_0\| + (1-a)\|y - y_0\| \\ &= ad(x, \Theta_i) + (1-a)d(y, \Theta_i), \end{aligned}$$

and thus *Claim 2* holds.

Now we prove that Θ is a convex set. For any $x, y \in \Theta$ and $a \in [0, 1]$, by *Claim 1* and *Claim 2*, we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} d(ax + (1-a)y, \Theta_i) \leq \lim_{i\to\infty} (ad(x, \Theta_i) + (1-a)d(y, \Theta_i)) = 0.$$

By *Claim 1* again, we get that $ax + (1-a)y \in \Theta$, and thus Θ is a convex set. □

Remark 4.5 *Under the conditions of Corollary 3.5, by the above proof and (4.11) we have* $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} G_i(A) = G(A), \forall A \in \mathbb{S}(d)$.

5 Multi-dimensional laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations

In this section, we give a multi-dimensional (weak) law of large numbers and several corollaries. The idea for the proofs is similar to the one used in the above section and we omit the details.

Definition 5.1 *([13]) A d-dimensional random vector $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_d)$ on a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ is called maximal distributed if there exists a bounded, vonvex and closed subset $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$\hat{E}[\varphi(\eta)] = \max_{y\in\Gamma} \varphi(y), \ \forall \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Proposition 5.2 *([13]) Let η be maximal distributed. For any $\varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define a function*

$$u(t, y) = \hat{E}[\varphi(y + t\eta)], \ (t, y) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then u is the unique viscosity solution of the following parabolic PDE:

$$\partial_t u - g(Du) = 0, \quad u|_{t=0} = \varphi, \tag{5.17}$$

where $g = g_\eta : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $g_\eta(p) = \hat{E}[\langle p, \eta\rangle]$.

Remark 5.3 *It is easy to check that g_η is a sublinear function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then by Theorem 2.2, there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$g(p) = \sup_{q\in\Gamma} \langle p, q\rangle, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Theorem 5.4 *Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) each Y_{i+1} is independent from $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_i)$, $\forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$;

(ii) there exists a positive constant M such that $\hat{E}[|Y_i|^2] \le M$, $\forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$;

(iii) there exist a sequence $\{a_n\}$ of positive numbers and a sub-additive, positive homogeneous function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} (a_1 + \cdots + a_n)/n = 0$, and

$$|g_n(p) - g(p)| \le a_n|p|, \forall n, \quad p \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, \ g_i(p) = \hat{E}[\langle Y_i, p\rangle], \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Then the sequence $\{\frac{S_n}{n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges in law to G-normal distribution $N(\Gamma; 0)$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{S_n}{n}\right)\right] = \hat{E}[\varphi(\eta)], \ \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $S_n = Y_1 + \cdots + Y_n$, $\eta \sim N(\Gamma; 0)$ and $g(p) = \sup_{q\in\Gamma}\langle p, q\rangle, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Corollary 5.5 *Let $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ which satisfies conditions (i)(ii) in Theorem 5.4 and the following condition (iv).*

(iv) $\{g_i\}$ *converges to* g *pointwise, i.e.,* $\lim_{i\to\infty} g_i(p) = g(p)$, $\forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *where* $g_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $g_i(p) = \hat{E}[\langle Y_i, p\rangle]$, $\forall p \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then the result of Theorem 5.4 holds.

Define

$$\Pi := \{\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d | \Gamma \text{ is bounded and closed}\}.$$

Denote by d_H the Hausdorff distance on Π. Then by [2], (Π, d_H) is a complete metric space.

Corollary 5.6 *Let* $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of* $\mathbb{R}^d$*-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ *which satisfies conditions (i)(ii) in Theorem 5.4 and the following condition (v).*

(v) *There exists a bounded, convex and closed subset* $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_H(\Gamma_i, \Gamma) = 0,$$

where Γ_i *is a bounded, convex and closed subset of* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *such that* $\hat{E}[\langle Y_i, p\rangle] = \sup_{q\in\Gamma_i\subset\mathbb{R}^d} \langle q, p\rangle$, $\forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Then the result of Theorem 5.4 holds.

Corollary 5.7 *Let* $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of* $\mathbb{R}^d$*-valued random variables in a sublinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ *which satisfies conditions (i)(ii) in Theorem 5.4 and the following condition (vi).*

(vi) *Let* Γ_i *be a bounded, convex and closed subset of* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *such that* $\hat{E}[\langle Y_i, p\rangle] = \sup_{q\in\Gamma_i\subset\mathbb{R}^d} \langle q, p\rangle, \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^d$. *Suppose that* $\{\Gamma_i\}$ *is a Cauchy sequence in* (Π, d_H).

Then there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset Γ *of* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *such that* $d_H(\Gamma, \Gamma_i) \to 0$ *as* $i \to \infty$ *and the result of Theorem 5.4 holds.*

Remark 5.8 *By Corollary 5.6 and the definition of the Hausdorff metric* d_H*, following the proof of Theorem 3.6, we can easily prove Theorem 3.1 of [4].*

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the support of NNSFC, Jiangsu Province basic research program (Natural Science Foundation)(Grant No. BK2012720), and A Project Funded by the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD).

References

[1] Chen Z J. Strong laws of large numbers for capacities. arXiv: 1006.0749v1, 2010

[2] Henrikson J. Completeness and total boundedness of the Hausdorff metric. MIT Undergraduate Journal of Mathematics, 1999, 1: 69-80

[3] Hu F. Moment bounds for IID sequences under sublinear expectations. Sci China Math, 2011, 54: 2155-2160

[4] Hu F. General laws of large numbers under sublinear expectations. arXiv: 1104.5296v2, 2012

[5] Hu F and Zhang D F. Central limit theorem for capacities. C R Acad Sci Paris, Ser. I, 2010, 348: 1111-1114

[6] Hu Z C and Yang Y Z. Some inequalities and limit theorems under sublinear expectations, arXiv: 1207.0489, 2012

[7] Li M, Shi Y F. A general central limit theorem under sublinear expectations. Sci China Math, 2010, 53: 1989-1994

[8] Peng S G. G-expectation, G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus of Itô's type. in: (Benth F E, et al.eds.) Stochastic Analysis and Applications, Proceedings of the Second Abel Symposium, 2005, Springer-Verlag, 2006, 541-567

[9] Peng S G. Law of large numbers and central limit theorem under nonlinear expectation. arXiv: 0702358v1, 2007

[10] Peng S G. Multi-dimensional G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus under G-expectation, Stoch Proc Appl, 2008, 118: 2223-2253

[11] Peng S G. A new central limit theorem under sublinear expectation, arXiv: 0803.2656v1, 2008.

[12] Peng S G. Survey on normal distributions, central limit theorem, Brownian motion and the related stochastic calculus under sublinear expectations, Sci China Ser A, 2009, 52: 1391-1411

[13] Peng S G. Nonlinear expectations and stochastic calculus under uncertainty, arXiv: 1002.4546v1, 2010

[14] Wang L H. On the regularity of fully nonlinear parabolic equations II. Comm Pure Appl Math, 1992, 45: 141-178

[15] Zhang D F. A weighted central limit theorem under sublinear expectations, arXiv: 1105.0727v1, 2011